

REMARKS:

Claims 23 – 107 are pending in the application. Claims 102 – 107 are new. Claims 23, 47, 51, 59, 74, 81, 83, 90 and 96 have been amended.

Independent claims 23, 59, 74, 81, 86, 90, 92, 94 and 96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by over Vora et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,273.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 23. As amended, this claim recites "[a] computer readable medium storing instructions that when executed by a personal computer connected to a network are capable of causing the personal computer to: display a meta-folder, wherein the meta-folder is a file system object that is associated with search criteria" and "in response to receiving the command to open the meta-folder, initiate searching the network and the personal computer for conventional objects according to the search criteria." Applicant respectfully submits that Vora fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Instead, Vora teaches "each client system...running the search application software" (see Vora, col. 18, lines 55-56). For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 23 and its corresponding dependent claims are patentably distinct over Vora.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 59, 74, 81, 86, 90 and 96 and their corresponding dependent claims are patentably distinct over Vora for reasons similar to those set forth for claim 23.

Regarding claims 92 and 94, Applicant can find no teaching or suggestion in Vora of "display[ing] an icon representing a search object along with one or more icons representing conventional objects in a window of a graphical user interface, wherein the search object defines a searching criteria," as recited in claim 92. Vora does not appear to teach or suggest "an icon representing a search object." Accordingly claims 92 and 94, along with their respective dependent claims, are also believed to be patentably distinct over Vora.

Applicant submits that new claim 102 is also patentably distinct over the cited art. For example, Applicant submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest, among other things, "in response to receiving the command to open the meta-folder, initiating searching the network and the personal computer for conventional objects that satisfy the

search criteria,” as recited in claim 23. Claims 102 and its dependent claims are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.


A fee authorization is enclosed to cover this extension fee. However, if the fee authorization is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6057-06101/BNK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Fee Authorization
- ☒ Petition Under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 For Extension of Time
- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 28, 2006

By: 
B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800